University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Anthony F. Starace Publications | Research Papers in Physics and Astronomy

2-13-2015

Comment on "Universality of Returning Electron Wave Packet in High-Order Harmonic Generation with Midinfrared Laser Pulses"

M. V. Frolov
Voronezh State University, Russia, frolov@phys.vsu.ru

N. L. Manakov
Voronezh State University, manakov@phys.vsu.ru

Wei-Hao Xiong
Peking University

Liang-You Peng
Peking University

J. Burgdörfer
Vienna University of Technology

See next page for additional authors

Authors
M. V. Frolov, N. L. Manakov, Wei-Hao Xiong, Liang-You Peng, J. Burgdörfer, and Anthony F. Starace

Comment on "Universality of Returning Electron Wave Packet in High-Order Harmonic Generation with Midinfrared Laser Pulses"

In Ref. [1], Le *et al.* establish in the long-wavelength limit a universal shape for the returning electron wave packet in high-order harmonic generation (HHG) as a function of the returning electron's energy. Based on this approach, Le *et al.* suggest a universal wavelength scaling law, $\propto \lambda^{-4.2}$, for the HHG yield for laser wavelengths in the range $3\ \mu\text{m} \le \lambda \le 6\ \mu\text{m}$. This scaling law differs from the faster decrease of the HHG yield with increasing λ, $\propto \lambda^{-(5-6)}$, predicted earlier [2–5]. Le *et al.* attribute this difference to the limited interval of wavelengths ($\lambda \le 2\ \mu\text{m}$) used to solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (TDSE) in Refs. [2,3,5]. Since the HHG yield is a fundamental quantity for practical applications, any new scaling law for $\lambda \gtrsim 3\ \mu\text{m}$ must be clearly justified owing to its importance for planning experiments involving the generation of extreme ultraviolet radiation by means of HHG using long-wavelength lasers.

The apparent disagreement stems from the use in Ref. [1] of a different definition of the harmonic yield $\Delta\mathcal{Y}$ from that used in Refs. [2–5]. As noted in Ref. [5], the λ-scaling law depends on the precise definition of $\Delta\mathcal{Y}$. In Ref. [2], the authors study "the scaling of an average harmonic yield, obtained by integrating the power spectrum over a fixed bandwidth." (They integrate the HHG power spectrum over harmonic energy intervals of 40–80 eV for He and 20–50 eV for Ar.) In Ref. [4], the definition of harmonic yield from Ref. [2] was adopted for a monochromatic field, defining the yield $\Delta\mathcal{Y}$ in terms of the HHG power. For a short-pulse laser field, in Refs. [3,5], a definition of the HHG yield compatible with that in Ref. [2] is used; i.e., $\Delta\mathcal{Y}$ is defined as the energy radiated per unit time by the target atom (subjected to a laser pulse of duration $\mathcal{T}$) into a fixed harmonic energy range $[\Omega_1, \Omega_2]$:

$$\Delta\mathcal{Y} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}} \int_{\Omega_1}^{\Omega_2} \rho(\Omega) d\Omega, \qquad (1)$$

where $\rho(\Omega)$ is the spectral density of harmonics with energy Ω. (Although Ref. [3] properly defines the HHG yield in words, the factor $1/\mathcal{T}$ was inadvertently omitted in Eq. (2) of Ref. [3]; this omission was corrected in Eq. (3) of Ref. [5].) Since the laser pulse has a fixed number N of optical cycles, $\mathcal{T}$ scales linearly with λ. By inserting the recolliding wave packet results of Ref. [1] into Eq. (1), the scaling $\Delta\mathcal{Y} \propto \lambda^{-5.2}$ found in Refs. [2–5] is confirmed.

In conclusion, we have shown that when the same definition for the HHG yield is used [cf. Eq. (1)], the results of Ref. [1] give the same scaling law found earlier in Refs. [2–5] for wavelengths $\lambda \le 2\ \mu\text{m}$. We note that this latter scaling law can be obtained analytically by using results of the model developed in Ref. [6] for the description of short-pulse HHG spectra. These analytic results as well as new numerical TDSE results for longer wavelengths, $\lambda \le 4\ \mu\text{m}$, will be published elsewhere.

This work was supported in part by NSF Grant No. PHY-1125915, RFBR Grant No. 13-02-00420, Ministry of Education & Science of the Russian Federation Project No. 1019, NSF Grant No. PHY-1208059, NNSFC Grants No. 11322437 and No. 11121091, Program 973 No. 2013CB922402, SFB-NEXTLITE (FWF, Austria), and the Dynasty Foundation (M. V. F.).

M. V. Frolov,[1,2] N. L. Manakov,[1] Wei-Hao Xiong,[3]
Liang-You Peng,[3,4,2] J. Burgdörfer[5,2] and
Anthony F. Starace[6,2]

[1]Department of Physics, Voronezh State University
Voronezh 394006, Russia
[2]Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106-4030, USA
[3]State Key Laboratory for Mesoscopic Physics and
Department of Physics, Peking University
Beijing 100871, China
[4]Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter
Beijing 100871, China
[5]Institute for Theoretical Physics
Vienna University of Technology
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10, A-1040 Vienna, Austria, EU
[6]Department of Physics and Astronomy
The University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0299, USA

Received 18 August 2014; published 9 February 2015
DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.069301
PACS numbers: 33.80.Eh, 42.65.Ky

[1] A.-T. Le, H. Wei, C. Jin, V. Ngoc Tuoc, T. Morishita, and C. D. Lin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 033001 (2014).
[2] J. Tate, T. Auguste, H. G. Muller, P. Salières, P. Agostini, and L. F. DiMauro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 013901 (2007).
[3] K. Schiessl, K. L. Ishikawa, E. Persson, and J. Burgdörfer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 253903 (2007).
[4] M. V. Frolov, N. L. Manakov, and A. F. Starace, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 173001 (2008).
[5] K. L. Ishikawa, K. Schiessl, E. Persson, and J. Burgdörfer, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 033411 (2009).
[6] M. V. Frolov, N. L. Manakov, A. M. Popov, O. V. Tikhonova, E. A. Volkova, A. A. Silaev, N. V. Vvedenskii, and A. F. Starace, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 033416 (2012).

